

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-34 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 11, 22, 31, and 32 are currently amended. Reconsideration is requested.

All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnel in view of Agarwal. With regard to claim 1, the Office asserts that the limitation “the network management server further configured to request that a network device load the network management application from another device, the network device being among the one or more network devices” is taught in Bonnel at column 7, lines 14-21 (Agarwal is relied upon by the Office for teaching other limitations of the claim). Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited section of Bonnel specifically states that “knowledge modules are stored locally at the site of each server system on which the agent process is to run.” It follows that the knowledge modules are not selected and then downloaded from the console system, which the Office equates to the claimed network management server. As taught in the Specification at page 4, lines 12-13, “network device 102 facilitates the transfer of applications from an application server 108 to the other network devices and nodes on the network.” Claims 1, 11, 22, 31, and 32 have been amended to emphasize this distinction. In particular, claim 1, as amended, recites “performing an analysis of use of network resources on the one or more network devices connected to a network using the one or more status packets, the network management server further configured to request that a network device load the network management application from another device.” Similarly, claim 11 recites “receiving the network management application at the network device from another network device over the network wherein the network management application includes the network management instructions for

reconfiguring the network device and performing the analysis task.” Similarly, claim 22 recites “the network management server further configured to request that a network device load the network management application from another device.” Similarly, claim 31 recites “means for receiving, from another network device, the network management application at the network device over the network wherein the network management application includes the network management instructions for performing the analysis task,” and claim 32 recites “receive, from another network device, a network management application at the network device over the network wherein the network management application includes the network management instructions for performing the analysis task.” Claims 2-7, 9-10, 13-30, and 33-34 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-34 based on Bonnel in view of Agarwal is therefore requested.

For the reasons stated above, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' Attorney to discuss any matters which might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

03/19/2007
Date

/ Holmes Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-467

Dd: 3/17/2007